



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,949	07/21/2004	Gad Talmon	014787.0005	8436
60/707 7590 02/22/2010 SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE PLLC C/O CPA Global P.O. BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
TORRENTE, RICHARD T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/22/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,949

Applicant(s)

TALMON ET AL.

Examiner

RICHARD TORRENTE

Art Unit

2621

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11,13-24,26,27,30-47,49-55 and 57-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11,13-24,26,27,30-47,49-55 and 57-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 46 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 46 stated "currently amended" but did not show any amended element (no underlined or deleted item). For the sake of prosecution, the Examiner assumes the "currently amended" statement is a typo and should state "previously amended". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-24, 26, 27, 30-47, 49-55 and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolle et al. (US 2002/0062482) in view of Lipton et al. (US 2005/0146605) for the same reason as the last office action dated 8/21/09.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Bolle and Lipton are not in the same field of endeavor. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bolle and Lipton are both in the video surveillance field. Bolle disclosed a monitoring system that transmits images and/or features of images to be processed and displayed at the server station, wherein the displayed features are analyzed by the operator for events at the server end. Lipton disclosed a monitoring system wherein features are analyzed by the server for detecting events at the server end. Given the teachings as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Lipton teachings of server event detection into Bolle human event detection for the benefit of a centralize processing of multiple video sources, and to produce a real time alarm based on an **automatic detection of an event** from video surveillance data. This would also eliminate the need for multiple operators to monitor multiple sites. Thus, reducing labor cost.

Applicant also argued that Bolle does not disclose generating non-image feature data but generate compressed image data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bolle examples in any of fig. 5-10 clearly shows that a compressed feature data is sent and not a compressed image data. A compressed image data would require a complete encoding/compressing of an image for proper decoding/decompressing, this means that a timer can not stop a process until the whole frame is done. Bolle figs. 5-10 (e.g. 586

and 587 in fig. 5A) clearly show that this is not the case, the parameters (features) are transmitted (587) individually or by set regardless of the whole image so as stopping the timer (586) prior to transmitting the rest of features would not affect the decoding/decompressing end. Bolle 590 in Fig. 5A further showed the features are transmitted and not the compressed image because the lines are continuously plotted (decoded/decompressed) individually to be displayed on a screen (note that if the features were sent as a compressed image, the display system would require an overlay circuit to superimpose one image over another but this is not the case for Bolle) until a reset signal is indicated.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RICHARD TORRENTE whose telephone number is (571) 270-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Richard Torrente/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Young Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621

RT